

## REMARKS

In paragraph 1 of the Office Action, the Examiner objected to the use of the indefinite article "a" required correction to the indefinite article --an--. This has been done in an amendment to the specification and it is requested that this ground of objection be withdrawn.

In paragraph 2 of the Office Action, the specification was objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. The basis of the objection 10 was that the expression which referred to the mixture of fluorine containing grease and urea-containing grease in claim 10 was identified as not being included in the specification. The specification has been amended to include the substance of claim 10. For this reason, it is requested that this ground of objection be withdrawn.

In paragraph 3 of the Office Action, claim 4 was objected to on the basis that in the 15 expression "has a evaporation", the indefinite article "a" should be replaced with --an--. This has been done by this amendment and it is requested that this ground of objection be withdrawn.

In paragraph 4 of the Office Action, claim 4 was objected to on the basis that the spelling of "trimethylolpropane" and "pentacrythritol" were incorrect. These spelling errors 20 have been corrected where required and it is requested that this ground of rejection be withdrawn.

In paragraph 6 of the Office Action, claim 10 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph because the subject matter of the claim was not supported by the specification.

Reconsideration is requested in view of this Amendment.

The specification has been amended to recite the specific mixture of claim 10. For 25 this reason, it is requested that this ground of rejection be withdrawn.

In paragraph 8 of the Office Action, claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter that the applicant regards as the invention in that it was unclear what the grease composition 30 comprises. In response to this ground of rejection, claim 1 has been amended to include the substance of allowed claim 2. Examples 1-8 of Table 1 are mixtures of Grease 1 and Grease 2 and are thus mixtures of a fluorine-containing component and a urea containing component. For these reasons, it is believed that this amendment avoids the basis of the rejection and it is requested that this ground of rejection be withdrawn.

In paragraph 10 of the Office Action, claims 1, 8, 9 and 12 were rejected for obviousness double patenting over claims 6-8 of U.S. 6,673,750.

Reconsideration is requested in view of this Amendment.

5 The amendment of claim 1 which has incorporated the substance of allowable claim 2 obviates this ground of rejection. For this reason, it is requested that this ground of rejection be withdrawn.

In paragraph 11 of the Office Action, claim 1, 8, 9 and 12 were rejected as being patentably indistinct from claims 6-8 of commonly assigned U.S. 6,673,750.

10 Reconsideration is requested in view of this Amendment.

The amendment of claim 1 which has incorporated the substance of allowable claim 2 obviates this ground of rejection. For this reason, it is requested that this ground of rejection be withdrawn.

15 In paragraph 13 of the Office Action, claims 1,7, 9 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Hirata. It is assumed that the cited reference was intended to be Hirata 2002-327759.

Reconsideration is requested.

20 The amendment of claim 1 to include allowable claim 2 avoids the present ground of rejection. For this reason, it is requested that this ground of rejection be withdrawn.

In paragraph 15 of the Office Action, claims 1,7, 9 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Hirata (U.S., 6,673,750).

Reconsideration is requested in view of this Amendment.

25 The amendment of claim 1 which has incorporated the substance of allowable claim 2 has eliminated the basis for this ground of rejection. For this reason, it is requested that this ground of rejection be withdrawn.

30 The Examiner is thanked for his courtesy in indicating the allowability of claims 2-6, 11 and 13. As noted above, claim 2 which was dependent on claim 1 has been combined with claim 1 to essentially place claim 2 in independent form. The remaining claims are directly or meditately dependent on claim 1 and thus all claims are in condition for allowance.

An early and favorable action is earnestly solicited.

5

10

15 Hedman & Costigan, P.C.  
1185 Avenue of the Americas  
New York, NY 10036  
(212) 302-8989

Respectfully Submitted,



James V. Costigan  
Registration No. 25,669

8